

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 8, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-4 were pending, allowed claims 2 and 3 and rejected claims 1 and 4. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended, new claims 5-15 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 3 of the Action the Examiner indicated, "Claims 2 and 3 are held to be allowable."

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Yogo or Miyashita. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended.

An interview was held with the Examiner on July 6, 2006 and the substance of the interview is discussed below.

As discussed with the Examiner, a range of independent claims are included in the application. Claim 1 emphasizes that the multilayer body is built on a metal layer, the metal layer is vacuum adhered to a core substrate and the metal layer with the multilayer body is separated from the core substrate by breaking the vacuum. As discussed with the Examiner, these features are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

As discussed with the Examiner, new claim 5 emphasizes that a pair of vacuum adhered metal layers are used with one formed on the substrate, the other used for forming the multilayer body and where the two metal layers are separated by breaking the vacuum, thereby separating the multilayer body from the core. As also discussed with the Examiner, these features are also not taught or suggested by the prior art.

As discussed with the Examiner, new claim 6 emphasizes that a pair of vacuum adhered metal layers are used, one smaller than the other with the smaller one formed on the core substrate, the other used for forming multilayer body and where the two metal layers are separated by breaking the vacuum by cutting through the structure within the smaller metal layer thereby separating the multilayer body from the core. As discussed with the Examiner, these features are additionally not taught or suggested by the prior art.

As discussed with the Examiner, the above-discussed features are discussed on application pages 6-11 with respect to figures 1-3.

It is submitted that the inventions of the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, the inventions of claims 9-15 variously call for additional metal layers and bump formation not found in the prior art. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that claims 2 and 3 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 10, 2006

By: /J. Randall Beckers/  
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501